

Chapter XXXIX

THE GREAT TREASON

The Gospel, Jesus Christ's "Good News" is, above all, the historic record of His Resurrection. On rising from the dead, the Incarnate God interrupted the natural process and gave human existence a new dimension. Instead of the death and decay that seemed to be the unavoidable end of all things, we now have everlasting life in front of us.

The apostles were the eyewitnesses of this unique phenomenon. They could say: "I saw Him; I spoke with Him; I learned from Him; I touched Him; I ate with Him after His resurrection from the dead." That was why those men were not afraid of death at the hands of the unbelievers, "in the certain hope of their own resurrection."

Today when the *Gospel* to most men is but a narrative, a legend about certain episodes in the life of Christ, and when an apostle is but a white-bearded itinerant master of the first century of the Church, it is almost impossible to imagine the impact of this "Good News," the abolition of death, that was "scandal to the Jews and foolishness to the Greeks." Although Christ's resurrection is the basis of our Catholic Faith, a large number of would-be Christians have replaced hope in their own resurrection for an insatiable interest in social progress, a preoccupation for the things of this world, which indicates they are convinced that "death is the end of everything," although they continue to say that they believe in the resurrection and eternal life.

Before His death and resurrection, Christ told His disciples the conditions necessary to attain everlasting life. At Capernaum's synagogue, a day after He announced and prefigured the Eucharist by feeding a crowd of more than five thousand souls with a few pieces of bread and a few fishes He had blessed, He said: "Unless you eat my flesh and drink my blood, you will have no life within you. He who eats my body and drinks my blood has eternal life and I will raise him up on the last day."

Since that time, many of His disciples have abandoned Him, saying: "How can this Man feed us with His body and give us His blood to drink?" This teaching, this truth, is too preposterous for human intelligence. Those who objected before the Lord's Passion and death, had the excuse that Jesus had not explained to them the supernatural fact of Transubstantiation, thanks to which we can really eat the body and drink the blood of God's Son. This explanation

was kept for the twelve apostles, who, at Jerusalem, were with Him at the cenacle the night before He was executed as a criminal. When He, taking the bread, said "*This Is My Body*," and taking a cup of wine, said: "*This Is My Blood*," the apostles, among other ineffable emotions, were perhaps relieved, for the Master had finally fulfilled and explained the mysterious words He had uttered at Capernaum.

From this point of view, the Church is an organization set up to keep the truth that the Mass is the passport to eternal life. In a way, the other sacraments have been set up to protect it, as it is a kind of center of our whole religion. Through Baptism we symbolically and sacramentally participate in Christ's death and become eligible for the glorious resurrection. Once original sin is eliminated, we reach the state of grace we need to avoid "eating or drinking Christ's body and blood for our own condemnation." Through absolution, the Sacrament of Confession permits us to recover the state of grace that perhaps we had lost through grave personal sin. The Sacrament of Holy Orders is the guarantee that the miracle of Transubstantiation will be continually repeated by priests chosen for this office as successors to the apostles, and whose ministry therefore is valid.

Along with their perennial attacks against the Church, the forces of evil have always challenged the Mass in one way or another. Sometimes they have attacked the externals of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, such as the apostolic succession or the auricular confession, and at other times, the very Mass itself.

In the first centuries the heretics emphasized the denial of the Incarnation. The question of whether bread and wine had actually been changed into Christ's body and blood was a secondary one in respect to the fundamental question of whether God has or could have assumed a human body or, better yet, become a man without ceasing to be God. This is what we might call *the heresy* for, from the first century until our times, this has been the root of all heresies: the denial of the Incarnation because matter is always evil. The spirit, which is good, cannot dwell in the flesh, which is evil. *Gnosticism*, a philosophical and religious doctrine, a mixture of Christian doctrine with Jewish and Oriental beliefs, has taken various names and challenged the Church from the first years of its existence. During those first years, Saint Justin Martyr used the *resurrection of the flesh* as a cry to fight gnosticism which proclaimed only "the immortality of the soul," and to warn the believers that, "If you believe only in the immortality of the soul and fail to accept the resurrection of the body, you are not Christians."

The most dangerous and widespread recrudescence of gnosticism was that of the Cathars, in 13th century Europe. This was the religion of the "pure people," and Saint Dominic fought them with his Order of Preachers, while Simon of Montfort set up a crusade against them. Though the movement was smashed, it could not be completely destroyed. *Afterwards, it reappeared in*

Puritanism, which insisted in affirming that "matter" was evil, and consequently, Transubstantiation could not be admitted or taught. They isolated some words taken from the New Testament: "God is a spirit, and those who worship Him must do so in spirit and truth." Puritans, then just as today, implicitly deny the essential doctrine of Christianity—the Incarnation of the Word, the Redemption on the Cross, and the Resurrection of Christ.

Neither they nor their successor Reformers could easily suppress the liturgical service of Communion, for this is clearly taught by Holy Scripture, so they and their successor heretics took away the orthodox meaning of the Sacrifice. The Cathars used the following *consecrating prayer* at the Last Supper: "O Lord, Jesus Christ, who blessed the five pieces of bread and the two fishes in the desert, and blessed the water that became wine: Bless, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit this bread, fish, and wine, not as a sacrificial offering, but as a simple commemoration of the most Holy Supper of Jesus Christ and His apostles." This is the basis of the subsequent appearances of heretical doctrines regarding the Eucharist that reject the Oblation and the Sacrifice.

One of the responses of the Church against the threat of the Cathars was the institution in 1285, of the last reading of the Gospel by the priest, on coming back from the altar to the sacristy. His genuflection on pronouncing the words, "et Verbum Caro factum est" ("and the word became Flesh") was a guarantee that he was not a secret Cathar, and that he really had the intention of consecrating at the Mass he had just celebrated, thereby causing his words to accomplish the Transubstantiation.

When in 1965, after almost 700 years, the reading of the last Gospel was suppressed because of arguments "it did not belong to the primitive rite," those of us who knew our theology and the history of the Church understood that the attacks of the heresy against the Mass had begun again in our age.

Ecumenical Council XII, also known as Lateran IV, which met in 1215 and was attended by 400 bishops, 800 abbots and priors, and delegates of the Christian monarchies, issued a dogmatic definition against the Albigensians and the Cathars. We quote:

One is the Universal Church of the believers, outside of which no one can be saved, and in which the priest himself is the Sacrifice, Jesus Christ, whose body and blood, under the species of bread and wine in the Sacrament of the Altar, really find themselves there, through the Transubstantiation of the bread into the body and the wine into the blood, by virtue of the divine power, in order that we receive from Him the same He took from us, thus perfecting the mystery of unity. And none can effect this Sacrament except the priest who has been duly ordained according to the power of the keys of the Church which Christ gave His apostles and their successors.

As an evident result of this Council and its definitions, devotion and worship of the divine Eucharist grew palpably during the 13th century. *The celebration of Corpus Christi was set up.* Saint Thomas Aquinas enhanced it with his magnificent hymns. Processions and the exposition of the Most Holy Sacrament became increasingly popular in that century and the following one, thus contributing greatly to the increase of Christian life among the believers.

However, the attacks of the heresy did not stop. In England, John Wycliffe, and in Bohemia his disciple John Hus, contended that Christ's words could not be literally construed. They had to be understood the following way: "This is my body" had to be translated: "This means my body." This was a preparation for the subsequent Protestant contentions. In 1577 a book was published in Germany, containing 200 different interpretations of the words, *Hoc est Corpus Meum.*

On denying Transubstantiation, both Wycliffe and Hus added other errors to back their heresy. Wycliffe challenged the apostolic succession and the exclusive right of the hierarchical priests of consecrating, teaching that only "good" men could preside at the Lord's Supper. Hus demanded Communion under both species in order to contradict the orthodox doctrine which affirms that under the appearance of only bread or wine we receive Christ as a whole, for Christ cannot be divided. Nowadays Communion under both species is demanded, the Sacrifice is denied, and the rite is becoming but a "memorial of the Last Supper."

In the 16th century, the anti-Catholic forces gathered themselves together around the three big heresiarchs: Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin. Though each of them taught a different doctrine and spoke of each other in a scarcely flattering way, they agreed in hating the Mass, "that cannot be sufficiently abominated" (Luther). They adopted all the heresies of the past and created some of their own, thus setting up and spreading what is now called the Reformation.

We know the means to which Archbishop Cranmer resorted to destroy the Mass in Protestant England. Along with two other Protestant leaders, Cranmer requested a public contest with Catholic theologians on Transubstantiation. This public discussion took place at Oxford and centered around three statements:

1. By virtue of the words of Christ which the priest utters, the body and blood of Christ are actually present in the Eucharist, under the appearance of bread and wine.
2. After the consecration, there is no remaining substance of bread or wine but only the body and blood.
3. The Mass is a real sacrifice that profits the living and the dead as a propitiation for their sins.

After a three-day dispute, the Protestants saw themselves obliged to repudiate the authority of Lateran Council IV "for not being in agreement with

the Word of God." Although this repudiation was the logical outcome of Protestant doctrine, the Catholics, the arguing theologians, and the listeners, became quite surprised.

"What?" the presiding Catholic theologian exclaimed, "You do not accept the Lateran Council?"

"No; we do not," answered the Protestants.

There was nothing to be added. In repudiating a Catholic doctrine, the doctrine of Christendom, they repudiated the very idea of apostolic continuity and its development. Karl Adam said it in his work, *The Spirit of Catholicism*:

Catholicism cannot and must not be identified with the faith of the primitive Church, the way a big bush cannot be identified with a tiny seed. There cannot be a mechanical identity, but only an organic identity. Christ's Gospel would not have been a living Gospel if it had remained the small seed sown in the earth in the year 33 of our age and had not developed deep roots to become a leafy tree. This is what 16th-century Protestants could not accept. To fight this principle they resorted to, or invented, the absurd historical theory that a modern historian named, "Search for the acorn." In other words: when you see a beautiful tree, look for the acorn similar to the one that germinated and developed to give birth to the tree, and say: "Do not pay any attention to the tree, for to be what it should, it would be necessary that it become an acorn."

To really understand this preposterous theory of "primitivism," who would now dare, for example, to ask that the House of Commons have its headquarters in Witanagemot and hold its meetings at Kingston-on-Thames or that Congress have its headquarters and sessions at Independence Hall in Philadelphia? Primitivism is not only absurd, but hypocritical. It should not mean that primitive customs are restored to the last detail but these examples indicate that primitivists have selected those primitive details prone to discredit today's customs. The reformers found, or thought they had found, in ancient documents what they believed justified their bold reforms. In the year 150 of our age, Saint Justin Martyr, wrote a letter to Emperor Marcus Aurelius to convince him that Christians were not involved in any criminal conspiracy as their enemies had claimed. The conditions and the places where, according to Saint Justin's description, the Mass was celebrated in those days, were imposed by persecutions and limited to utmost simplicity. In fact, Justin's description is not that of the normal worship of the primitive Church, the way a letter written inside a war airplane during a battle, would fail to depict England's regular 20th-century life.

This letter by Saint Justin served Protestants with an excuse plus the extra advantage that this document calls the celebrant a "president," so as not to convey to the emperor the wrong impression that he was identifying the

Catholic priest with the pagan priest.

Thus, whimsically choosing a letter written on a specific occasion for a specific purpose, Protestants invented the myth of "real Christianity" to back their absurd designs and the vernacular service of Communion. Replacing their altar with a table, stripping their churches of all images, and turning the Eucharist into a Memorial Supper, they made the celebrant the "president," who sits at the table facing the people.

Since people had been accustomed to consider the Mass as a sacrifice for centuries, the Protestants began to use the ambiguous expression, "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," which is still included in the prayer book of the Anglican Church. This gave the attendants the impression that the idea of "sacrifice" had not been eliminated, even in those strange rites.

To fight heresy, another ecumenical council was summoned, that of Trent. Besides ratifying the decrees of Lateran Council IV passed three centuries before, the Council of Trent passed new decrees and dogmatic definitions which are the expression of our Catholic Faith even today. As concerns the Sacrifice of the Mass, the most important subject, the Tridentine Council confirmed the old apostolic doctrine of the Church, namely:

Should anyone contend the Mass is just a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving or just a memorial of the sacrifice at the cross, instead of a propitiatory sacrifice; or that it only profits him who receives it and must not be offered for the living and the dead for expiation of sins, remission of penalties, impetration, and the other needs we have, let him be anathema.

After this Council, Pope Pius V published the Roman Missal, designed to safeguard in the whole Church the Faith so much fought by the heretics. The so-called Tridentine Mass was then prescribed by his apostolic Constitution, *Quo Primum* on July 17, 1570:

Through this, our Constitution, that will stand perpetually, on penalty of our anger, we order that never be anything added, taken away or changed in our Missal. . . . In virtue of holy obedience we command . . . that, laying aside all of the rites of other Missals, even though these be very old and have been used so far, from now on . . . [priests and bishops] must read and sing the Mass according to the rite, the way and rules prescribed by us in this Missal . . . we forbid that, in the celebration of the Mass, ceremonies or prayers other than the ones included in this Missal be added or recited. . . . And we permit and grant that this Missal be used in all sung or prayed Masses *without any scruple of conscience, without incurring any penalty, sentence or censorship from now on, with freedom and legitimacy, through our apostolic authority, by virtue of this document, eiam perpetuo, (perpetually).*

Thus the Tridentine Mass was an insurmountable wall against heresy until April 3, 1969, when the present Pope, through his Constitution, *Missale Romanum*, approved the new vernacular Mass, adapted to the practices and principles of the Protestants. It has to be celebrated on a table, and the priest has to face the people, as a "president" of the meeting.

In England and other parts of the world there was an immediate response to the new vernacular Mass. On May 10, 1969, the Pope's directions were translated. On the 17th of the same month, The Latin Mass Society sent the most Holy Father a petition asking that he preserve the Tridentine Mass according to Saint Pius V's Missal. In September, Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci handed the Pope a critical analysis on the New Mass, prepared by outstanding theologians from Rome, demonstrating that the *Novus Ordo Missae* "as a whole and in every detail is impressively far from the Catholic theology of the Holy Mass." The Latin Mass Society immediately published a translation of this analysis, sending it to every single bishop, monsignor, priest, and religious in England. The hierarchy forbids the priests to comment on the document, and we may guess the 700 copies were thrown into the basket for waste paper.

In this important document, the theologians demonstrated that the New Mass had been essentially rebuked by the synod of bishops; never had it been put to the collegial wisdom of the episcopal conferences or requested by Christian people. It would please most modernist Protestants. Using ambiguous terms, it emphasizes the idea of "Supper" instead of "Sacrifice." It does not discriminate between divine Sacrifice and human sacrifice. It declares that the bread and wine are changed only spiritually, not substantially. It contains no reference to Christ's real presence, which seems to have been implicitly rebuked. The status of the priest and the people have been adulterated to such an extent that the celebrant is almost equated with a Protestant minister and the real nature of the Church is unbearably falsified. The abandonment of Latin signifies an attack on the unity of the Church, not only with respect to worship, but also with respect to beliefs.

The *Novus Ordo Missae* is no defense against heresy which, today like yesterday, continues to challenge the Eucharistic dogmas. The *Ordo* "impressively deviates from the dogmatic doctrine of the Council of Trent," which all Catholics must consciously profess on penalty of everlasting condemnation. In summary, the *Novus Ordo Missae* includes numerous ambiguities and not a few errors that stain the purity of the Catholic religion and smash all defenses of the deposit of faith.

The Vatican, the bishops of England and Wales and those of the rest of the world, see eye-to-eye in the way of pretending theological ignorance, and demand blind obedience to the new liturgy. To avoid suspicion, they executed changes in a most gradual way. In his pastoral letter of October 12, 1969, Cardinal John Heenan²³ put it this way:

Why does the Mass keep changing? The answer is that it would have been difficult to execute the changes simultaneously. Had all the changes been made at the same time, you would have all been shocked.

A month afterwards, Cardinal Heenan wrote a prologue to the English translation of the New Mass:

Wise Pope Paul VI has made up his mind to put an end to experiments. He is happy, because the form of the Mass will need no further changes in the foreseeable future . . . It is important to note that the revision has been carried on under the Holy Father's personal supervision. Thus, it cannot be accepted that the *Novus Ordo Missae* contains doctrinal errors.

The above words by the Cardinal imply that everything the Pope does or says is correct, *ipso facto*. This suggests that the Pope is a pagan oracle, whereas Catholic doctrine teaches that Peter's successor is infallible only when he defines *ex cathedra*, as Pastor and Teacher of the entire Church on penalty of everlasting condemnation, a doctrine contained in the deposit of divine revelation, regarding faith or morality. In all other cases, he is as fallible as any other human being.

The Pope's fallibility is, actually, the shield of his infallibility. He who affirms that the Pope, just because he is a Pope, cannot err, exposes our Faith to a bitter and fallacious criticism, such as that which our foes have launched against the Catholic dogma of the Pontiff's infallibility. For instance, Lytton Strachey wrote:

In his bull, *Cum inter nonulos*, John XXIII affirmed that the doctrine of Christ's poverty was heretical, and his predecessor, Nicholas III, in his bull, *Exiit que seminat*, had written that the doctrine of Christ's poverty was a real doctrine, and only heretics could deny it. If John XXIII stated a Catholic truth, Nicholas III taught heresy. And if John XXIII was wrong, his teaching was definitively heretical. What about infallibility, then?

The opposition between those opinions does not impair papal infallibility. Those are the views of two men, and the solution will arise through the regular process of theological discussion. In like manner, the conflict between Paul VI and Saint Pius V regarding the *Ordo Missae* is a conflict between two men's opinions. Bearing in mind that Saint Pius V's *Ordo Missae* espoused the doctrine of Trent and was designed to defend our Faith against Protestant errors, our choice cannot be a hard one.

Professor Gordon Rupp, one of the most famous Lutheran theologians, in speaking about the Vatican's questioning the excommunication of Luther, said:

It appears to be a logical step, since Vatican II agrees in so many fields with Luther's doctrine, for which he was condemned.

Paul VI himself is said to have been surprised at the extensive resistance to the New Order of the Mass. He devoted two allocutions, those of November 19 and 26, 1969, published by *L'Osservatore Romano* on November 27 and December 4, 1969, to defend the New Mass. He said, "The Mass with the new rite remains the same Mass as ever." He maintained that the new form was the Will of Christ, thus suggesting he had spoken infallibly when setting up the *Novus Ordo*, although he did not say so openly. He explained that the changes were made to shatter the apathy of the believers and to "help make the Mass a peaceful but efficient school of *Christian sociology*." He affirmed that Latin is "the language of the angels" and provided simple people with a small consolation, since they would no longer be able to hear the divine services in a language used for nineteen centuries. He also promised to use that language for "the official acts of the Holy See." He ended by saying: "*Let us not talk anymore about the New Mass. Let us rather talk about the new age in the life of the Church.*"

Every Catholic who really cares for his religion must have wondered: Why has all this taken place? We cannot believe what we are beholding; the Vatican is dismantling our Faith. This cannot succeed; it must be a nightmare from which, sooner or later we shall wake up and find every sacred thing untouched and in its original state. Anyway, why have the Pope and the bishops acted this way?

To give them an answer, we must give a brief explanation on *ecumenism*. When, on January 25, 1959, John XXIII announced "an ecumenical council," non-Catholic people, according to an article Cardinal Bea published in 1961, "thought the idea consisted of convening a council where the representatives of all Christian churches or communities would gather together to discuss the problems of unity." This interpretation was derived from the very term *ecumenism*, which is used in our times to mean rapprochement among so-called Christian religious groups. This meaning of the term, which describes the representatives of all the Christian denominations, was first used in the last century to establish unity among these groups. The wrong interpretation of it was cleared up afterwards.

Cardinal Bea was too optimistic. The meaning of the ambiguous term *ecumenism*, was never cleared up. Not even today do people know what it means. Many people keep believing that since Vatican II, like all general councils of the Church, called itself an ecumenical council, this meant, in a canonical sense, a gathering of all bishops in Communion with the Apostolic See. Protestants, of course, would construe these words in the same way, but Protestant ecumenism is the deadliest heresy of all. It is not only indifferentism,

which says that all religions are good, but a denial of the very reality of the Church. It teaches that the real Church no longer exists, nor has it ever existed, but that it will exist in the immediate future through a blend of all viewpoints, beliefs, and religions that claim to be Christian. The World Council of Churches, which coordinates 239 sects, is the representative organ for the time being.

Despite Pope Paul VI's visit to the seat of the World Council of Churches in Geneva, the Catholic Church still refuses to accept this final apostasy of joining the World Council of Churches. Should it do so, it would be proclaiming that it is but one among the so-called Christian sects. Paul VI, however, has not hesitated to send delegates as observers to that organization, and he himself appeared before it to deliver an enigmatic speech. Moreover, he did not find any valid objection of faith or conscience in accepting some Protestant pastors to help prepare the *Novus Ordo Missae*.

Confusion between the classical Catholic meaning of the word, *ecumenical* and the Protestant version of the words, *ecumenical movement*, facilitated the activities of the World Council of Churches. To avoid confusion, Vatican II had to pass a decree on *ecumenism*. Though pretended charity could have moved the Conciliar Fathers to compromise, the decree is, undoubtedly, a statement of our Catholic Faith and an implicit condemnation of the Protestant ecumenical movement. It affirms that all Christian communities outside of the Catholic Church are defective; that “[o]nly through the Catholic Church of Christ can the necessary means for Salvation be fully achieved,” that “[t]he unity Christ granted His Church when He founded it, still exists in the Catholic Church;” and that “[o]nly the Catholic Church possesses the total riches of revealed truth and all the means of grace.”

The Vatican II document on ecumenism endorses Pius XII's great encyclical, *Mystici Corporis*, on the nature of the Church, and says:

... [I]n fact, among the members of the Church can be counted only those who have received the regenerating water of Baptism and who, professing the real Faith, have not themselves parted miserably from the body, nor have been removed from it by the *legitimate* authority because of their most grave guilt.

The decree on ecumenism is, in fact, a decree against the Protestants' ecumenical movement, for it confirms the doctrine of Pius XII. Unfortunately, Pius XII's encyclical continues to be disregarded by those bishops who invite heretics and schismatics to preach at Catholic pulpits, and foster other activities that impair the Catholic Church's exclusivity. In particular, they emphasize that Baptism, valid Baptism, unites all Christians in faith, but they omit an equally important truth expounded in *Mystici Corporis*, that the attachment of an adult to a non-Catholic sect breaks the relationship established by Baptism,

since "schism, heresy, and apostasy, by their very nature, separate human beings from Christ's Body, the Church."

When the Vatican made a move of rapprochement toward the World Council of Churches, it deemed it necessary to change the Mass so as to please the ecumenical movement. To this effect, the very words of consecration pronounced by Christ Himself, which expressed Christ's Will on setting up the Eucharistic Sacrifice, were adulterated. Instead of saying His blood was shed for "many," it is now said it was shed "for all," this meaning not Redemption, but the application of the fruits of Redemption. This wicked and false doctrine of "the final salvation of all men," which is absolutely opposite to the Church's doctrine, is nowadays the fundamental rock of the entire structure of the modern heresy which bears the name of ecumenism.

Many centuries ago the heretics had attempted to change the phrase, "for many" to the phrase, "for all," which is used nowadays. Saint Thomas Aquinas rebuked such attempts which contradict Christ's very words at the Last Supper: "*Ego pro eis rogo. Non pro mundo rogo, sed pro his, quos dedisti mihi . . . Pater sancte, serva eos in nomino tuo, quos dedisti mihi, ut sint unum . . . Quos dedisti mihi, custodivi, et nemo ex eis periit, nisi filius preditionis . . .*" ("I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me . . . Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one . . . those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition . . .") (John 17:9-12). This sacerdotal prayer by Christ definitively states the Church's exclusivity. The world is saved through entering the Church. All men have the chance to save themselves through their entering the Church, but many exclude themselves freely, by their own will. The replacement then, of the words, "for many" by "for all," entails the idea of false ecumenism, according to which all men, whatever their creed or behavior, will be saved.

The history of this adulteration is an interesting one. In his already-mentioned allocution of Nov. 19, 1969, Pope Paul VI announced that "the changes had been introduced by eminent experts in sacred liturgy." He did not say however, that two Anglicans, a Lutheran, a Calvinist, and a representative of the World Council of Churches were among those experts, nor did he say, either, that the top "expert" was Joachim Jeremias, a non-Catholic, Jewish professor of the University of Göttingen, who had previously attacked Christ's divinity.

In his book, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, published in 1966, Dr. Jeremias invented the ingenious theory according to which when Jesus said, "for many," he meant "for all," because the Aramaic language does not include the word, *all*. This argument also attacks Catholic theology, which since the Council of Trent, has repudiated the words, "for all men." Nevertheless, the argument of Dr. Jeremias has no value whatsoever. We find the word *all* in a

passage from Daniel "all the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing" (Dan. 4:32). Moreover, in a 1961 grammar of biblical Aramaic, an entire section is devoted to the Aramaic word, *all*.

The explanation of this particular point of the New Mass, like other points, can be explained through what a person who is not accustomed to the current episcopal ways of thinking, would call a lie. The gravity of the case is such that this change of Christ's words *definitely invalidates all the vernacular Masses*, since there is no solid ground to demonstrate the opposite. The *Latin* version of the new Canons keeps the words, *pro multis* (for many); nowhere in this version is the phrase, *pro omnibus* (for all) used. This clear argument should at least cause people who naively accepted the vernacular translation to be suspicious, and this Latin version of the new Canons is equally invalid. Before explaining why, it is convenient to say something about the Canon of the Mass itself, because the ecclesiastical authorities, in affirming that the Canon of Pius V's Mass is only 400 years old, attempt to make us believe that the changes accomplished in the Canon are unimportant and accidental.

In his prologue to the English version of the new "Westminster Mass," His Eminence Cardinal Heenan summarized the grounds for the radical changes accomplished in the liturgy of the Mass. We quote:

The words and deeds that 400 years ago impressed people in the Elizabethian age would hardly suit the mentality and customs of 20th-century man.

This is not true, for the Canon of the Mass goes back to the early centuries of Christianity without any change whatsoever. This Canon was used before Saint Augustine began to evangelize Britain. The Canon he used in the first Mass he celebrated at Kent, was used in England with the very same words and language as were used in all Catholic Masses for the ensuing 1373 years, until Pope Montini abolished it in February of 1970.

Pius V's Tridentine reforms revised and unified the prayers and rites that had been introduced in certain places, but neither those reforms nor the prayers and rites modified the Canon, which was basically the same Canon of Christ. The Council of Trent itself makes us aware that the succession was unremitting:

Whereas the holy things must be piously handled; and whereas of them all [the holiest one] is this most Holy Sacrifice, the Catholic Church many years ago instituted the Holy Canon so that the Sacrifice could be worthily offered and received. The aim was that the Canon be free of any error to such an extent (Canon 6) that it contains nothing that does not express great holiness and piety and lift up to God the minds of those who offer it . . . [T]his is recorded in the Lord's very words, *the apostles' traditions and the Holy Pontiff's pious institutions*. (Denzinger, 942).

Martin Luther, on the contrary, spoke of the Canon with utmost contempt. We quote Luther:

That execrable Canon . . . is a summary of filthy traditions that have turned the Mass into a sacrifice. They have added offertories. The Mass is not a sacrifice nor the immolation of a priest. Along with this Canon we reject anything implying an oblation.

One of the chief architects of the New Mass, Msgr. Annibale Bugnini, seems to endorse this opinion of Luther, when he speaks about the famous *Formula Missae* (formula of the Mass) of 1523 published by the heresiarch as a *Missa Normativa*. The New Mass, which definitively destroyed the most ancient Canon, implies and incorporates all of Luther's principles.

As long as the Tridentine Canon was preserved, it was impossible to destroy the intention, the very essence of the Mass. That was why ecumenism demanded new and different Canons. One of them, the second one, is so innovating that any Protestant minister, or any renegade priest who does not accept Transubstantiation, can use it. Above all, according to Luther's recommendation, any reference to the Oblation has been eliminated.

On page 6 of Number 49 of the publication *Courier de Rome*, the outstanding theologian, Abbé R. Dulac, gives us the reason for it:

According to Luther and his followers, since the risen Christ no longer dies, He cannot become a victim at the Mass. At most, He can be mystically represented in the state of a victim, under the species of bread and wine. The bread and wine are, consequently, parts of the Sacrifice.

Once they eliminated the offertory and laid aside the Oblation, the compilers of Canon II incurred Cranmer's concealed heresy. They wrote: "Sanctify these gifts with the effusion of the Spirit, in order that *they be to us the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ*. They did not say "they be," but "*be to us*." This form specifically denies Transubstantiation. It can be used by any member of the sects belonging to the World Council of Churches for their Communion service. And this *ecumenical* intention undoubtedly destroys the validity of the Mass. Certainly, the Tridentine Canon also includes the word *nobis*, but the great prayers of Oblation that precede it make indisputable the intention, the reality of the Sacrifice.

The validity of the other Canons has also been destroyed. Many people say that, since Father so-and-so undoubtedly believes in the Transubstantiation, his intention validates the Mass he celebrates. Here, however, we are dealing with the *intention of Christ and the Church*, not with the *celebrant's personal intention or belief*. For instance, although Talleyrand²⁴ was

a self-confessed atheist, the ordinations he performed and those performed by the people he ordained were not necessarily void. What is requested from the celebrant is that he have *Christ's* intention, the *Church's* intention, not *his* intention. This principle explains why, for example, a female Muhammadan might validly administer Baptism in case of need, provided she uses the right words, performs the right actions, and has the intention of doing what Christ's Church does, even though she does not believe in what she is doing and saying.

The Modernist Church incorporated Canon II, which denies Transubstantiation, in order to show its ecumenical intention. Hence, it appears, that *its* intention is no longer *Christ's* intention and, as a result, none of its Canons are valid. No priest can celebrate a valid Mass using these Canons, no matter how solid his theological knowledge and how great his devotion.

Many Catholics are groundlessly convinced that the Mass is valid if it is read in Latin. The Society for the Latin Mass has been organized all over the world, and, therefore, the faithful must be warned against the ambiguity these movements purport. On condition of saving the ecumenical structure of the New Mass, the hierarchy could consider sponsoring the movement and even graciously conceding the use of Latin.

We must repeat again and again that in the Church (we are not speaking of the Eastern churches) there is no valid Latin Mass other than the Tridentine Mass of Pius V, which was instituted to safeguard the Catholic Faith in perpetuity. In order to impose the New Mass on us and to prohibit the eternal Mass of Saint Pius V, the bishops remind us of the obedience we owe them, but they, in turn, must remember that obedience to one's conscience is above obedience to men who should not command what faith or reason condemn. Even in the army, no soldier can invoke obedience to his superiors as an excuse to commit a crime. By obedience the bishops mean a meaningless surrender, an absurd imposition contrary to conscience, the same obedience that apostate priests professed to apostate bishops during the Reformation of the 16th century. In *those* days, a bishop defended the Faith and died for it; in *our* days, we have yet to see a John Fisher²⁵ fight the current subversion.

Faced with grand treason on the part of the ecclesiastics, the defense of the Church demands that the laity exert all conceivable efforts to look for faithful priests, in catacombs if necessary, who wish to continue to say the eternal Tridentine Mass. This is being done in many places. We are back to the age of the catacombs, and we must not be afraid of canonical censorship. Pope Pius V said:

We permit and grant [in perpetuity] that this Missal be used in all Masses . . . without any scruple of conscience, without incurring any penalty, sentence, or censorship from this day forward, with all freedom and legitimacy, through our apostolic authority, by virtue of this doctrine, *etiam perpetuo*.

It would be absurd to call schismatic those who, resorting to what Saint Pius V established perpetually in accordance with the standing doctrine of the Church for centuries, continue to celebrate the eternal Mass. It is not we faithful Catholics, but the ecumenists who are schismatics, heretics and apostates.

We do notice that the number of true Catholics is diminishing. Unfortunately, such has been the case whenever any schismatic or heretical movements have afflicted Christ's Church. Let us remember, however, that just because the Gospel has to be *preached* to the whole world, it does not mean that the whole world must *embrace* the Gospel. Christ, the apostles, and the Holy Fathers made the point that in this world the Church would be reduced to a small group. We have been warned of this great apostasy. We have been told by Hugh Ross Williamson:²⁸

... [T]here will come a time, when people will not tolerate a sound doctrine, but will seek after masters who flatter their passions, and, closing their ears to the truth, will open them to fables, . . . [so that] if it were possible, even the chosen ones would fall into error.